EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

December 12, 1985

CDI

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: SAM WYMAN
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
INTERAGENCY TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT GROUP

SUBJECT: Changes to the Draft Charter for the Interagency Technology Assessment Group

Based on the comments received, the following changes, underlined for clarity, have been incorporated into the final charter:

Paragraph 2, 4th subparagraph, 2nd sentence, change to read: They will play an even larger role in the future as the need for more capable conventional forces increases.

Paragraph 3, 1st sentence, change to read: The general thrust of this effort is to identify strategies that use applications of high leverage technology to respond to the threat by involving the Intelligence, Development and Analysis communities to determine how to influence the balance of power by exploiting Western strengths and threat weaknesses.

Paragraph 4, reorder subparagraphs 4a and 4b.

Paragraph 4d, change to read: Identify areas of potential technology cooperation in order to support on going U.S. efforts with all NATO allies.

Paragraph 6a, change to read: 5a Timeframe - mid to late 1990's with a nominal 10-year window for consideration of soviet responses.

Paragraph 6b, change to read: 5b Technologies as described in the problem definition will be available and producible to meet force structure requirements.

Paragraph 6c, 1st sentence, change to read: 5c The projected threat of the study timeframe will include likely technological advances.

Paragraph 6e, change to read: 5e <u>For study purposes only, technology described in the problem definition will be considered available for all allied scenarios</u>.

Paragraph 6f, add: Application of SDI technologies

Renumber paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 to become 6, 7, 8 and 9.

A revised charter is attached.

Attachment

CHARTER

INTERAGENCY TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT GROUP

1. Membership. The study group will have membership from the organizations and agencies listed below. The named individuals will constitute the executive committee.

Office of the Secretary of Defense
Mr. D. Fredericksen, Chairman
Dr. T. Tegnelia

Central Intelligence Agency
[redacted] STAT

Defense Intelligence Agency
[redacted] STAT

Department of the Army Staff
BG. W. Knudson
BG. R. Greenwalt
Mr. H. Woodall

Department of the Air Force Staff
MG. T. Loh

Office of Science and Technology Policy
Dr. M. Roesch

Notes:
1. The Chairman will determine final OSD membership. Additional OSD members will be added as appropriate.

2. LTC Wyman, USA, is designated as the Executive Secretary to coordinate the study group's activities, prepare and distribute minutes, prepare special reports and to perform other duties as directed by the Chairman.

3. Dr. Barry Smernoff, National Defense University, will be an ex-officio member.

2. Background.

The massive Soviet and Warsaw Pact (WP) buildup in Europe will continue well into the future.

The President, in his 23 March 1983 SDI speech, stated that technologies are now available that will significantly improve our conventional forces and reduce the risk of a conflict escalating to nuclear war.

General Rogers, SACEUR, has made public statements to the effect that he would have to resort to nuclear weapons in 5 to 7 days after the start of a European conflict. He is pursuing the doctrine of Follow On Forces Attack (FOFA) and supports R&D for systems that can see and strike deep into the enemy's rear area.

In meeting the threat, our allies play a major role. They will play an even larger role in the future as the need for more capable conventional forces increases. Our allies are responsible for countering about 70% of the threat in the European war scenario. Consequently, it is extremely important that they deploy forces and adopt doctrine and tactics to meet their share of the threat.

3. Purpose. The general thrust of this effort is to identify the strategies that use high leverage technology to respond to the threat by involving the Intelligence, Development and Analysis communities to determine how to change the balance of power by exploiting Western strengths and threat weaknesses. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to investigate and determine what effect introducing new technologies, as defined in paragraph 7 (Problem Definition), would have on the ability of allied forces to withstand a WP attack in Europe without having to resort to early use of nuclear weapons.

4. Objectives. The following are the study objectives:

a) Formulate threat force structure assessments, system vulnerabilities estimates, operational capability estimates and a creative assessment of the likely threat response to our technology initiatives, doctrine, tactics and force structure and assess the Soviet view of the projected correlation of forces.

b) Determine the relative effectiveness of new technologies to increase the capability of allied forces to repel any Warsaw Pact aggression without resorting to early use of nuclear weapons.

c) Identify cross-service mission priorities to fully exploit new technology. This may require review of Close Air Support (CAS) and Battlefield Air Interdiction (BAI) as examples.

d) Identify areas of potential technology cooperation in order to support on going U.S. efforts with all NATO allies.

e) Make recommendations for Defense Guidance (DG).

f) Make recommendations to the services for incorporation in their Program Objective Memorandums (POM).

5. Assumptions. The following are the study assumptions:

   a) Timeframe - mid to late 1990's with a nominal 10-year window for consideration of soviet responses.

   b) Technologies as described in the problem definition will be available and producible to meet force structure requirements.

   c) The projected threat of the study timeframe will include likely technological advances. The threat scenario will be reviewed by the study group.

   d) Doctrine, tactics and force structure will be modified appropriately to take maximum advantage of the technologies introduced into the study.

   e) For study purposes only, technology described in the problem definition will be considered available for all allied scenarios.

6. Problem Definition. Complete scenarios and appropriate details will be added as the study program is developed. Similar studies for different regions will be made. These regions include Central Army Groups' (CENTAG) area in Europe, Korea, Southwest Asia and others as specified. The following is the basic outline of the problem definition for this study:

   a) Region - NATO region, north of the US V and VII Corps. The region may further be constrained to NORTHAG.

   b) Time of year - Spring

   c) Alert warning - short warning scenario, 10 days from initial warning to WP attack.

   d) Use of nuclear weapons - allied forces restricted from use; WP forces not restricted, they will follow expected doctrine

   e) Use of chemical weapons - use will follow expected doctrine

   f) Candidate technologies to be evaluated:

      (1) "Super smart" munitions
      (2) Advanced ground and air sensors
      (3) RPVs/DRONES/Cruises missiles
      (4) Improved munitions
      (5) National technical means
      (6) Application of SDI technologies
      (7) Other

7. Force Array Input. The threat array will be a composite provided by the intelligence community to the study group for inclusion into the analysis. For any US forces that become part of the allied force array, the appropriate force structure, technology and program specialists from OSD and the services will provide the US array. The allied force array will be generated using available resources with additional input from NATO and international specialists.

8. Analysis Approach. The methodology to evaluate the effect of the technologies will be developed by a subcommittee designated by the Chairman. A comprehensive set of evaluation criteria will also be developed. Modeling, simulation and wargaming, as well as, results from test and strategic planning exercises will be used in the development of the methodology to understand the dynamics involved and produce the results. Intelligence estimates and analyses will be an integral part of the analysis.

9. Results. A study report will be published with appropriate classified annexes to detail the impact of introducing new technologies on the ability of the allies to repel a WP attack to include comprehensive threat force structure assessments systems vulnerabilities, operational capabilities and likely responses to our technology initiatives. Recommendations for DG input and priorities in service POMs will also be documented. The distribution list will include appropriate recipients; to be determined.

   Results of this study could be used as a response to National Security Council Staff concern for conventional force modernization.

   A special note will be included which will contain recommendation for similiar studies in different regions with the same or different technologies.

DRAFT

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Conventional Initiative Technology Assessment

It has been one of the Reagan Administration's priorities to strengthen our conventional warfighting capability. The President, in his 23 March 1983 speech which is mostly remembered for initiating the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), stated with equal emphasis that the technologies are now available that will significantly improve our conventional forces and reduce the risk of a conflict escalating to nuclear war. In other words, there must be a parallel effort to SDI in the conventional force arena.

Dr. G. A. Keyworth, the President's Science Advisor, has been a major proponent of introducing highleverage technologies and developing a comprehensive investment strategy to ensure that the most effective technologies and systems to respond to the Soviet and Warsaw Pact threat are fielded. Interest in integrating the intelligence and technology communities to do this peaked earlier this year when Dr. Keyworth asked the Central Intelligence Agency to become involved and assist in making a detailed assessment. That initial request sparked an informal working group which has been working to develop a plan to integrate the various communities so that a comprehensive analysis of the high-leverage technologies and systems could be made. The analysis would determine if we're being responsive to the real threat, applying the most effective technology and being sensitive to the likely threat response to our initiatives.

DRAFT

The purpose for my memorandum is to formalize the previous efforts and to ensure that there is a commitment to support the process with the appropriate resources. Attached is a charter that has been prepared, with input recommendations from your staffs, which will provide a more detailed explanation of what is intended.

I look forward to obtaining meaningful results that will assist us in making sure that our programs are responsive to the threat. Your support is needed and is essential to the success of this effort.

Don Hicks

Attachment

DISTRIBUTION:

Action List

Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy
Director, Defense Intelligence Agency
Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
Deputy Director for Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Tactical Warfare Programs
Secretary, United States Army
Secretary, United States Air Force
Director, Net Assessment

Information List

Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation

10/1/86

Interagency Technology Assessment Group

Subject: Minutes of the Interagency Technology Assessment Group (ITAG) Meeting, 20 December 1985 (2nd Meeting)

1. Attendees:

Mr. D. Fredericksen	OSD(TWP)
Dr. J. Tegnelia	DARPA
Mr. L. Larsen	OSD(CI)
[redacted]	DIA STAT
	DIA
	DIA
LTC T. Hines	OSD(Net Assessment)
Dr. M. Roesch	OSTP
MG S. Nichols	CIA(NIO)
[redacted]	CIA(NIO) STAT
	CIA(OSWR)
	CIA(OSWR)
BG. D. Greewalt	US Army(ACSI)
Mr. H. Woodall	US Army(DCSRDA)
LTC W. Hanna	US Army(DCS/OPS)

2. Introduction:

The agenda for the meeting is attached. The purpose of the meeting was to inform the group of the results of the briefing to Dr. Hicks by Dr. Tegnelia, Mr. Fredericksen and Dr. Roesch and to outline the next steps to formalize the analysis efforts.

3. Review of previous minutes/action items:

a. Mr. Fredericksen discussed the meeting with Dr. Hicks. The major comments were that Dr. Hicks was positive about the concept of the ITAG and suggested using "white" technology to validate the analytical process. Dr. Hicks also suggested that an informal briefing should be given to the Director, DIA.

b. The revised charter with a list of the changes made was distributed. (See attachment)

4. Discussion:

a. A draft letter that would formalize the ITAG was handed out and discussed. The letter is intended to be signed by Dr. Hicks and set to the participating agencies, etc., to obtain a commitment to support the ITAG effort. The letter will be staffed with participants so that it will be ready for an early January 1986 signature by Dr. Hicks. A specific comment was made to include reference to appropriate National Security Decision Directives (NSDDs). (See attachment)

b. The major portion of the meeting centered on the purpose and context of the analysis effort. Concerns expressed were:

1) that only looking at one area such as NORTHAG would not allow understanding of the effect on CENTAG,

2) the lack of U.S. forces in the short warning scenario,

3) the methodology of determining theater level performance,

4) the use of appropriate databases

c. The general concensus was that the purpose of this effort was to:

1) show which technology and systems are important

2) be an interactive effort, most analyses use a static threat, the threat for this effort will be responsive

3) include black programs in the analysis

d. Mr. Fredericksen established a subcommittee for analysis with Dr. M. Roesch as its chairman. Participating agencies will be contacted for a representative to this subcommittee. Mr. Fredericksen asked that a draft analysis plan be prepared and presented at the next meeting. Subcommittees will be established for threat, technology and others as needed.

5. Action Items:

a. Draft letter to formalize ITAG for Dr. Hicks' signature by early January 1986. The Executive Secretary is responsible for coordination

b. The Analysis Subcommittee is responsible for developing an analysis methodology. The draft will be presented at the next meeting.

c. The next meeting will be scheduled in late January 1986 after responses are received from Dr. Hicks' letter.

Samuel D. Wyman III
Executive Secretary
395-3110